

#### **United States**

### . ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Washington, DC 20460

## SUPERFUND PROPERTY REUSE EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR REPORTING THE SITEWIDE READY-FOR-ANTICIPATED USE GPRA MEASURE

THE SITEWIDE	E READY-FOR-ANT	CICIPATED USE	GPRA MEASURE
		ation and Federal Facili	ties Restoration & Reuse Office
PART A – GENERAL SITE INF	FORMATION		
1. Site Name		2. EPA ID	
Fridley Commons Park Well Field		MND985701309	
3. Site ID B528 0506449		4. RPM David Seely	
5. Street Address	•		
61 <sup>st</sup> Avenue, NE & 7 <sup>th</sup> St.,	NE		
6. City Fridley	7. State MN	. 8.	Zip Code <b>55432</b>
9. Site Wide Ready-for-Reuse De	etermination Requirements	(all must be met for the e	ntire construction complete site)
uses, so that the ✓ No institutional  Institutional Control  D	for any media that may after are no unacceptable rill controls are required by  Date Implemented	sks.	Total Acres
Name N/A			25
PART B – SIGNATURE (Brai	nch Chief or above shoul	d sian)	25
NOTE: The outcome of this Property Re	use Evaluation does not have any onsibilities, expectations, or benefit reuse activities. EPA retains any expecifically retains any and all right ection with the site, including but no conditions at the site that indicat	legally binding effect and does ts of any party. EPA assumes r and all rights and authorities it h is and authorities it has to condi of limited to instances when nev	uct, direct, oversee, and/or require v or additional information has been conditions at the site are no longer
Thomas R. Short, Jr.		Chief, Remedi	al Response Branch #2

13. Date

2013

EPA Form 9100-4 (9-2012)



#### UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### REGION 5 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

Date:

June 19, 2013

From:

**David Seely, SR-6J (6-7058), RPM** 

Thomas Nash, C-14J (6-0552), ORC Attorney

To:

Thomas R. Short Jr., Chief

Remedial Response Branch #2

Subject:

Recommendation to Sign the Site Wide Ready for Anticipated Use

Determination for the Commons Park Well Field, Fridley, MN

The Fridley Commons Park Well Field Site, Fridley, MN, achieved Construction Completion on October 25, 2005 based on the remedy selected in the Record of Decision (ROD) of September 27, 2005. All cleanup goals for the site have been achieved for media that may affect current and reasonably anticipated future land uses.

The 2005 ROD specified that no CERCLA action was required, except for additional ground water monitoring due to uncertainties as to whether a continuing source remained. No construction efforts were required to implement the ground water monitoring activities.

EPA Internal FAQ Guidance for Implementing the SWRAU Performance Measure (unsigned, undated) states:

"Ground water-only sites may not be able to achieve a SWRAU designation. However, if EPA has assessed the soil and surface contamination in a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) and the surface area above the contaminated ground water is ready for its anticipated use, or if EPA performed removal actions that addressed the soil and other surface contamination, then the site may be eligible to be SWRAU..."

A separate RI/FS document was never completed for the Commons Park Well Field site. The ROD was based upon previous site investigations performed by the City of Fridley and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA). These studies were summarized in the *Fridley Commons Park Technical Memorandum (MPCA, at the request of EPA, July 15, 2005)*, which was made part of the ROD Administrative Record. The *Technical Memorandum* Summary states:

"TCE was the only contaminant found consistently at levels of concern. A limited investigation was conducted in an attempt to identify the source of the contamination in the Fridley Commons Park Well Field. There was no source that could be clearly identified or attributed to the contamination at the site. Monitoring wells placed in the unconsolidated glacial drift water table aquifer indicated that the shallow aquifer is not contaminated. Therefore, it appears that the source of the TCE is not from the site area itself but has migrated to the well field from some other location."

Contamination at the site is limited to TCE in the ground water. Exposure to contamination is limited to uses of the water supply and is regulated under the Safe Water Drinking Act. Contaminant concentrations at the site have been below the established MCL, which is a health-based standard, since January 2004. Therefore current concentrations of TCE at the site are considered protective of human health. There are no ecological exposures so ecological risks were not evaluated.

Cleanup goals for ground water allow for and were based on:

$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	unlimited use unrestricted exposure
	residential use
	commercial
	industrial use
	recreational
	containment
	other (explain)

Institutional Controls were not selected as part of the remedy and are not needed, at this time, for the remedy to remain protective.

Physical Area - Summary Table

Media, Engineered Controls, & Areas That do not Support Unlimited Use/Unrestricted exposure (UU/UE) Based on Current Conditions	IC Objectives in Decision Documents	Physical Area Covered by Implemented Institutional Control
Groundwater – No ICs required, although it should be noted that all of the onsite wells are currently located in a municipally-owned park, and current surface land use is recreational.	N/A	N/A

Hazardous substances do not remain at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. Pursuant to CERCLA Section 121 (c) and as provided in the current guidance on Five-Year Reviews: OSWER Directive 9355.7-03B-P, Comprehensive Five Year Review Guidance, June 2001, a five-year review is not required.

Although the remedy no longer requires routine monitoring of the water supply wells and a 5-Year Review is not required, the water supply will continued to be monitored as required by the SDWA requirements.

We've also reviewed the current Human Exposure Environmental Indicator and have determined that the Site is "Long-Term Human Health Protection has been Achieved" and is consistent with this Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use determination.

Based on the above information and all documents reviewed for this site, we find that the site meets the following requirements:

- All cleanup goals in the ROD or other decision document have been achieved for any media that may affect current and reasonably anticipated future land uses, so that there are no unacceptable risks.
- All institutional or other controls required in the ROD or identified as part of the response action to help ensure long-term protection have been put in place.

Based on the information presented below, we are recommending that you sign the attached Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use Determination Checklist.

Region 5 may, in the future, modify the Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use Determination based on changed site conditions.

Cleanup Goals	Safe Drinking Water Act Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL)
Construction Complete Date	October 25, 2005
Five Year Review Date	N/A
Human Exposure	Long-Term Human Health Protection Achieved
Environmental Indicator	
NPL Deletion Date	N/A
Existing Land Use for Entire	In recreational use as municipal park. No plans for
Site /Status of Use	redevelopment at this time.
Last Inspection Date:	N/A, but 2012 aerial photo confirms continuing recreational
	reuse (see Figure 2). RPM also confirmed land use on August
	22, 2012 when he participated in an event across the street
	from the site.
Anticipated Future Land Use	Municipal park and water supply.
Media, Remedy Components,	None
& Areas that do not support	,
UU/UE Based on Current	
Conditions	
Acres Associated with	None
Institutional Control	
Total Property Acres	25
Title of Institutional Control	N/A
Instrument	
IC Implementation Date	N/A
Documents Reviewed for	ROD, PCOR, and EI Worksheets. Microsoft Bing Maps.
SWRAU Determination	
ICTS Booklet (attach)	N/A

#### Footnote 1:

In order for ICs to be considered "in place and effective", the following must be met (check all that apply):

_	the ICs cover all physical areas that do not support unlimited use/unrestricted exposure (UU/UE) and the ICs' physical description of the non-UU/UE areas are accurate based on <u>current</u> conditions for the entire site (e.g., groundwater ordinance covers the entire plume area; legal description of cap in restrictive covenant has been mapped or undergone other verification);
	all needed land use restrictions/objectives are stated in/covered by the IC;
	title work shows recording and that no other existing property rights will interfere with the site remedy or cause undue exposure (for restrictive covenants and other proprietary controls only), there is current compliance with the land use restriction determined by a recent inspection; and future compliance with the restrictions is expected because: a) there is a legal basis for enforcing the use restriction against current and future owners; and/or b) ORC and Superfund Branch Chiefs concur that the totality of the circumstances supports the expectation of future compliance with restrictions. (Examples: UECA covenant, state solid waste deed notice in conjunction with state solid waste regulation prohibiting interference with landfill component, best available IC has been implemented such as fish consumption
	cause undue exposure (for restrictive covenants and other proprietary controls only), there is current compliance with the land use restriction determined by a recent inspection; and future compliance with the restrictions is expected because: a) there is a legal basis for enforcing restriction against current and future owners; and/or b) ORC and Superfund Branch Chiefs concurtotality of the circumstances supports the expectation of future compliance with restrictions. (Exa UECA covenant, state solid waste deed notice in conjunction with state solid waste regulation pro



# PAGE REMOVED DUE TO EXEMPTION 9